

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action mailed March 12, 2004 finally rejecting the claims then pending in the application, namely claims 1 - 10.

As a result of the present amendment, claims 5 and 10 are cancelled. Thus, claims 1 - 4 and 6 - 9 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 6 are independent. Claims 2-4 and 7-9 depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively.

FIG. 3 has been amended to correct a typographical error as indicated in the attached replacement sheet for FIG. 3. In particular, block 41 has been relabeled with an "R" to indicate that it is a register, as is stated at page 22, lns. 18-19 of the detailed description. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to FIG. 3 do not constitute the addition of new matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to now recite "a decoder for receiving the plurality of digital compressed video streams and for decoding frame frequency value information and display pixel number information contained in the digital compressed video streams, the frame frequency value information including frame frequencies and the display pixel number information including numbers of horizontal pixels; a clock for generating a timing signal having a clock frequency; and a converter for producing digital video signals associated with the plurality of digital compressed video streams by replacing differences among the decoded frame frequencies with differences among the numbers of horizontal pixels so that the digital video signals can be processed using the same clock frequency, wherein said converter sets the numbers of horizontal pixels based on the displayed pixel number information and the frame frequency information." Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found by reference to, for example, page 16, lns. 4-19 and page 17, lns. 15-22 of

the detailed description.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to improve their form. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 2 and 3 do not constitute the addition of new matter.

Claim 6 has been amended to now recite "decoding frame frequency value information and display pixel number information contained in the digital compressed video streams, the frame frequency value information including frame frequencies and the display pixel number information including numbers of horizontal pixels; generating a timing signal having a clock frequency; reproducing digital video signals representative of the compressed video streams by replacing differences among the decoded frame frequencies with differences among the numbers of horizontal pixels; and processing the digital video signals using the same clock frequency." Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 6 do not constitute the addition of new matter. Support for these amendments may be found by reference to, for example, page 13, ln. 20 to page 14, ln. 3, and page 16, lns. 4-23 of the detailed description.

Claims 7 and 9 have been amended to improve their form and in view of the amendments to claim 6. As such, applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced into the application as a result of the amendments to claims 7 and 9.

In the Official Action of March 12, 2004 the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. (Official Action, pg. 2.) In particular, the Examiner "noted that the specification and Fig. 2 disclose that the pixel converter (9) converts pixel for decompressed or decoded video signal." (*Id.*) As indicated above, claim 1 now recites "a converter for producing digital video signals associated with the plurality of digital compressed video streams by replacing differences among the decoded frame frequencies with differences among the numbers

of horizontal pixels so that the digital video signals can be processed using the same clock frequency." Claim 6 has been amended to now recite "reproducing digital video signals representative of the compressed video streams by replacing differences among the decoded frame frequencies with differences among the numbers of horizontal pixels." Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments to claims 1 and 6 render the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, now moot.

In the Official Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,118,486 to *Reitmeier* (hereinafter "*Reitmeier*"). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 6, as amended, are not anticipated by *Reitmeier*.

The *Reitmeier* reference discloses a digital television receiver that includes a video processing section and a display device timing section. (*Reitmeier*, col. 3, lns. 45-48.) The video processing section includes video decoder 120, de-interlacer 130, vertical resizer 140, horizontal resizer 150 and frame buffer 160. (*Id.*, lns. 48-51.) The display device timing section includes a clock circuit 110, read address generator 180, a write address generator 185 and a raster generator 190. (*Id.*, lns. 51-53.) The clock circuit 110 generates a system clock (" f_{sys} ") and a raster clock (" f_{rast} ") based on a reference clock ("PCR") (*Id.*, col. 4, lns. 36-51.) The raster clock is fed to the raster generator, which generates a fixed frequency horizontal deflection signal H-DEF and a vertical deflection signal V-DEF. (*Id.*, col. 6, lns. 40-43.) *Reitmeier* clearly discloses that different frame frequencies are processed using different horizontal deflection frequencies and/or raster clock frequencies. (*Id.*, col. 10, lns. 39-47.)
To wit:

It must be understood that the information contained in Table 2 is based on a video frame rate of 30.00 Hz. The ATSC standard, and other standards, also allow 29.97 Hz frame rates (i.e., a factor of 1000/1001 frame rate reduction). Therefore, slight modifications to, e.g., the horizontal deflection frequencies and/or raster clock frequencies listed in Table 2 can easily be made to accommodate 29.97 Hz frame rates.

(*Id.*) In contrast, claim 1 recites "a converter for producing digital video signals associated with the plurality of digital compressed video streams by replacing differences among the decoded frame frequencies with differences among the numbers of horizontal pixels so that the digital video signals can be processed using the same clock frequency." Indeed, *Reitmeier*, as indicated in the above quoted text, processes video streams having different frame frequencies using different clock frequencies. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Reitmeier* for at least this reason.

Further in this regard, the Examiner asserts that *Reitmeier's* horizontal resizer 150 includes means for "replacing differences among said frame frequencies by differences among the numbers of horizontal pixels for said plurality of digital video signals having the different frame frequencies" by citing to col. 5, lns. 25-36 of the *Reitmeier* reference. (Official Action, pg. 3.) In fact, the horizontal resizer 150 is disclosed as being "capable of increasing the number of pixels per line by, e.g., using interpolation techniques to calculate luminance and chrominance information of a new pixel to be inserted between two existing pixels." (*Reitmeier*, col. 5, lns. 30-36.) In addition, the resizer 150 is disclosed as being capable of decimating pixels. (*Id.*) As such, *Reitmeier* teaches that one can resize the horizontal display by adding or deleting pixels. In particular, pixels are added based on luminance and chrominance information whereas pixels are deleted or decimated

by simply decreasing the number of pixels per line. As such, the horizontal resizer 150 is not disclosed as being capable of "replacing differences among the decoded frame frequencies with differences among the numbers of horizontal pixels." Indeed, *Reitmeier* discloses no such relationship. It is only applicants' claims and detailed description, including the drawings, that disclose this limitation of claim 1. Therefore, *Reitmeier* also does not anticipate claim 1 for at least this reason.

Based on the foregoing, applicants also respectfully submit that *Reitmeier* does not anticipate claim 6. In particular, claim 6 recites "processing the digital video signals using the same clock frequency." In addition, claim 6 recites "replacing differences among the decoded frame frequencies with differences among the numbers of horizontal pixels." Applicants respectfully submit that the *Reitmeier* reference does not disclose either of these claim limitations. As such, claim 6 is not anticipated by the *Reitmeier* reference for at least these reasons.

As claims 2 through 4 and 7 through 9 depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, applicants also respectfully submit that these claims are not anticipated by *Reitmeier* for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with

this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge
Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Orville R. Cockings

Registration No.: 42,424

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

492957_1.DOC